

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	1			
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,371	09/10/2003	Robert L. Doubler	ZMS-G03US	6685
43541 7590 10/09/2007 WOOD, HERRON & EVANS (ZIMMER SPINE)			EXAMINER	
2700 CAREW TOWER			COMSTOCK, DAVID C	
441 VINE STREET CINCINNATI, OH 45202		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			3733	
•			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

*	H		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
•	10/661,371	DOUBLER ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Comstock	3733	
The MAÏLING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4a) Of the above claim(s) 3,4,7-9,11 and 12 is/a 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) 1,5,6 and 13-25 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or			
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on 11 September 2006 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the original of the control of the original of the control of the original of the control of the control of the original of the control	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: ____.

Art Unit: 3733

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11 May 2007 has been entered.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and 'In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Application/Control Number: 10/661,371

Art Unit: 3733

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 13-25 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 7,105,029. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because their effective differences reside merely in their stated intended use as set forth in the preambles; the structure claimed is substantially the same.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see response filed 11 May 2007, with respect to the rejections over Freedland et al. (6,162,234) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Accordingly, these rejections have been withdrawn. However, it has become apparent that the claims in the present application are substantially the same as those of U.S. Pat. No. 7,105,029. Therefore, the claims are not in condition for allowance and a double patenting rejection has been set forth above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Comstock whose telephone number is (571) 272-4710. Please leave a detailed voice message if examiner is unavailable. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eduardo Robert can be reached at (571) 272-4719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/661,371

Art Unit: 3733

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

D. Comstock

EDUARDO (C. ROBERT SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER